

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action dated April 6, 2004, the Examiner has issued a restriction requirement, and stated there are two related sub-combinations which are distinct from one another. Specifically, the Examiner states that Group I (claims 1-38) is drawn to a relational database management system, and Group II (claims 39-97) is drawn to creating a multilevel hierarchy and creating a visual display, which constitute patentably distinct sub-combination. Applicants respectfully traverse these statements of the Examiner, as the search for both Group I and Group II would not be any different. However, Applicants provisionally elect to proceed with the claims from Group II (claims 39-97) for prosecution on the merits.

Applicants understand that if the Examiner does not agree with Applicants' position above, then the Examiner will withdraw the claims of Group I (claims 1-38) from further examination pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.142(b).

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Appl. No. 09/744,618  
Reply to Restriction Requirement  
Page 3

**CONCLUSION**

The Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions concerning this Reply or if it will expedite the progress of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/3/04

By: James P. Muraff  
James P. Muraff, Reg. No. 39,785  
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.  
311 South Wacker Drive, 53rd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6630  
312.554.3300

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 C.F.R. § 1.8a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being deposited with the United States Postal Service with first class postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

May 5, 2004  
Gillian Gardner  
Gillian Gardner/199644

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**